



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,181	12/15/2003	Nathalie Mougin	05725.1303-00	2162
22852	7590	09/16/2009	EXAMINER	
		FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER	VENKAT, JYOTHSNA A	
		LLP		
		901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413	1619	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/734,181	MOUGIN, NATHALIE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT	1619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23,27,32-35,38-40,46,63-65,79-86,90 and 91 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23, 27, 32-35, 38-40, 46, 63-65 and 79-86 and 90-91 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/1/09 has been entered.

Status of claims

Claims **24-26, 28-31, 36-37 have been cancelled** as per applicants' amendment dated 5/29/09, Claims 1-23, 27, 32-35, 38-40, 46, 63-65 and 79-86 and 90-91 are currently examined in the application. Claims 87-89 and 92-93 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to **non- elected invention** (election with traverse dated 5/23/07) and claims 41-45, 47-62, 66-79 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to **non-elected species**(election with traverse dated 5/23/07).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-23, 27, 32-35, 38-40, 46, 63-65 and 79-86 and 90-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is lack of written description for the elected gradient polymer, which is "**ethyl acrylate/styrene/methacrylic acid**" having the weight percent recited in claim 1. Applicants' point out support to paragraph [069] of the specification.

There is indeed support for the weight percent of the monomeric residues recited in claim 1. **But this weight percent does not correspond to elected species.**

Paragraph [070] specifies the weight percent by describing each type of monomer. See below .

"[070] For further example, the at least one gradient copolymer as disclosed herein, can comprise a hydrophilic monomer ranging from 5% to 25% by weight, relative to the total weight of the copolymer, a monomer with Tg less than or equal to 20°C in an amount ranging from 50% to 90% by weight, relative to the total weight of the copolymer, and an additional monomer in an amount ranging from 5% to 25% by weight, relative to the total weight of the copolymer".

Paragraphs [076 and 080] describe the hydrophilic monomer and describe methacrylic acid. The weight percent of hydrophilic monomer should be 5-25%. However the weight percent of the elected species is now 50-90%. Applicants' attention is also drawn to [0195] for the weight percent to the elected species. This is 15.5%. This is not within the range of 50-9-% for the third monomer, which is methacrylic acid.

Paragraph [082-083] describes monomers with a Tg less than or equal to 20 degrees Celsius and describes ethyl acrylate. This weight percent is 50-90%. Elected species ethyl acrylate (first monomer) according to claim 1 is 5-25%. Paragraph [0195] describes the elected

species weight percent of ethyl acrylate as 68.4%. Paragraph [085] describes monomers with a Tg greater than or equal to 20 degrees Celsius and describes and describe styrene. The weight percent of monomers with a Tg greater than or equal to 20 degrees Celsius is described at paragraph [065] and the weight percent can be 25-50%, the elected species weight percent recited in claim 1 is 5-25% (second monomer). Paragraph [0195] describes the elected species weight percent of styrene as 16.1%. The weight percent of species can not be equated anywhere in the specification to the genus recite din claim 1. Therefore there is lack of written description for the elected species having the weight percent claimed in claim 1.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-23, 27, 32-35, 38-40, 46, 63-65 and 79-86 and 90-91 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over

claims 1-14, 21-26, 29-30, 37, 54-56, 70-83 and 89 of copending Application No. 10/734,301 (**now allowed**). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the hair cosmetic composition claiming hair gradient copolymer drawn to the elected species is also claimed in the co-pending application. Co-pending application , is claiming cosmetic composition comprising gradient copolymer comprising at least two monomeric residues and also claiming additional monomeric residue and this includes styrene.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JYOTHSNA A. VENKAT whose telephone number is 571-272-0607. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30-7:30:1st Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL WOODWARD can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JYOTHSNA A VENKAT /
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1619